



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,926	09/22/2003	Jie-Wei Chen	03-494	1618

34704 7590 08/26/2005

BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C.  
900 CHAPEL STREET  
SUITE 1201  
NEW HAVEN, CT 06510

EXAMINER

HEINRICH, SAMUEL M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/667,926	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Samuel M. Heinrich	<b>Art Unit</b> 1725	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/22/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

15

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show elements 8' and 8'' as described on page 8, and they fail to show element 17 as described on page 9, and they fail to show element 22 as described on page 10. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because both of the sentences are written using non-idiomatic language. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, claim 1, in the last line, "between the upper pressure plate (3) and the lower pressure plate (9)" appears to be out of place in the claim description.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-16 contain reference numeral limitations which do not clearly limit the claimed subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1725

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-11, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,884,906 to Morse in view of USPN 6,210,507 to Hansen et al. Morse discloses a workpiece support comprising multiple jaws which can accommodate multiple and various workpieces. Morse does not disclose a glass clamping face. Hansen et al disclose transparent clamp features (see Figures 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B) and the use of a transparent clamp element in place of a clamp element disclosed by Morse would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the transparent clamp is very well known and because the transparent clamp provides improved access to supported workpiece features. Morse disclose (column 5) working on fewer work pieces than the number of cavities, and this is a selective and prescribable clamping. The direction of the clamps being described in a vertical direction is simply a description of tooling orientation and does not impart patentability to the claim. With respect to using multiple interchangeable clamp elements, the use of multiple fixturing jigs for working on multiple workpieces is well known in the art as both Morse and Hansen et al disclose different fixture embodiments. Morse discloses (Figure 1) the use of a flexible resilient strip for

Art Unit: 1725

workpiece support. The use of transparent tape strips are very well known in the laser bonding art and the use of a transparent tape along with a transparent clamp would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the tape provides flexible workpiece support.

Claims 5, 7, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,884,906 to Morse in view of USPN 6,210,507 to Hansen et al as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of USPN 6,202,999 to Wayman et al. Morse discloses individually controllable clamps, but does not describe multiple pressures. Wayman et al disclose workpiece support having multiple varying pressure application. The use of a clamp having multiple pressure capability would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the multiple pressures provide better control of the workpiece during various processing steps.

### ***Conclusion***


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited art pertains to various clamp elements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Samuel M Heinrich  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1725

SMH